

Overview of Renton Human Services Funding Process for 2013/2014

Overview: In 2006, Council adopted a new funding process that moved away from funding core agencies to funding nine Renton *Results* (state of well being for Renton residents). Developed through intensive community input. *Results* include #6 and #7 which were not intended to be funded by Human Services.

It was felt that if we concentrated our funding on key areas, we could make a difference in community indicators. The intent was to do a community report card after each funding cycle, to show the difference the funding made. The challenge is that it is hard to separate out Renton's share of funding from other funding sources, as well as from what was happening in the community. Agencies also have control over the outcomes within their agency/clients but not over what is happening in the community.

Renton Results are:

1. All children and youth are ready for educational success, work, and life.
2. Individuals have adequate clothing, food, and healthcare.
3. All individuals become as self-sufficient as possible.
4. Residents know about domestic violence and how to keep safe.
5. All residents are proactive to issues of sexual assault and sexual violence.
6. All residents are healthy and safe.
7. All residents identify with and contribute to their community.
8. End homelessness in Renton.
9. Connect people to services.

Regional Process/Decisions

- Joint Memorandum of Understandings – when multiple cities fund an agency.
- Joint monitoring visits of the agencies that have joint MOU's. Agreement on what is included in a monitoring visit.
- In 2009, 17 cities decided to use common funding application. Solicited input and feedback from agencies and from representatives from advisory committees.
- In 2012, switched vendor, and City of Kent is administrator.
- In 2013, will use common reporting forms.
- Do common training on how to complete applications and reporting.
- The dates that applications are available and due are decided by all the cities.
- Agencies will report on all residents served in that City – not just the number that the City funds – so that cities can see the complete picture of what is happening in their jurisdiction.

Overview of Renton Human Services Funding Process for 2013/2014

Renton Process/Decisions

		<i>HSAC Decision</i>	<i>Staff Decision</i>
<i>Pre-Application</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum level of funding is \$5,000 for contracts • Late, incomplete applications not be reviewed • Applications not accepted for CDBG Capital. Capital \$ goes toward Housing Repair Assistance Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How incomplete is incomplete? # of agencies forgot to upload a document or complete a section of budget page
<i>Application Review</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members discussed their potential conflicts of interest. Much discussion around if someone knows a lot about domestic violence, should they be assigned to that result area or not. Was it a help or hindrance? • Members decided if they should read all the applications or a subset of them. Decided to divide them up by result area. • If a group reviewed more than one result, they could shift funds from one result to another, with the ok of the group. • Each result has a specific dollar amount allocated based on assessment of current human service needs in Renton. • Set aside \$5,000 off the top for capacity building • HSAC can change \$ assigned to each result area • Members and staff developed a rating tool and financial tool for scoring the applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each application is assigned to a Renton result. The agencies in the same result area compete with each other. If they might fit multiple results, agencies select their result. • Advisory Committee members are assigned to a certain result area(s) to review the applications. • Each result area assigned a percentage of the total amount of funds to allocate. Based on history & need • After the funding recommendations were made, to step back and make sure that full spectrum of services covered. • Use prior level of funding as the base for what we have to allocate
<i>Deliberations/Recommendations</i>	Going into process, no agreement as to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members had to be present for the two days of deliberations and be able to read and rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff scores the accuracy of the financial information

Overview of Renton Human Services Funding Process for 2013/2014

		<i>HSAC Decision</i>	<i>Staff Decision</i>
	<p>how much new agencies would be funded. Only when the different groups reported out, discovered that different groups treated the funding of new agencies differently.</p> <p>Agreement to fund new agencies at \$5,000</p>	<p>the applications. If they weren't able to do that, then they did not participate in the funding allocation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To score the application on what is in the application – not to use knowledge of the agency or look at how effective the program is. Felt that is subjective and non-transparent. Added 10 points for community impact, which was to rate the “human factor” of the agency which covers community needs, essential services, knowledge of agencies not covered in the application. • Rating tool used to assigned 100 points • Training on the rating tool and how to read an application • Performance History decision to deduct up to 5 point for not meeting contract goals and submitting reports in a timely manner. Previously, an additional 5 points was awarded, but the group felt that was too much of an advantage to currently funded agencies. The expectation is that funded agencies will meet their contract requirements and should not receive additional points for doing so. • Each group read and rated all the applications in their rating groups. • Ratings could be done electronically or on paper and submitted to staff to calculate average scores. • Average scores would be used to rank the applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff scores the performance history. • There was a lead assigned to each group – make sure funding process followed. Chair/vice chair/and staff. • Which agencies are funded by the general fund and which are funded by Community Development Block Grants. Our agreement with King County dictates how many agencies can be funded by CDBG and who meets the criteria • Staff provides a spreadsheet to each group showing applications in order from highest to lowest based on the average scores in their Result area.

Overview of Renton Human Services Funding Process for 2013/2014

		<i>HSAC Decision</i>	<i>Staff Decision</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups would review the summary of team scores to identify any significant variances needing discussion. Individuals allowed to change score after discussion, if desired. The top ranked agency within each result would get either what they requested or their prior level of funding Programs had to be funded in the order they are ranked, and a program could not be skipped to fund lower ranked program That agencies could not be allocated more funds than requested in the application After reaching consensus on their recommendations, groups presented recommendations to the full committee for review, discussion and adoption by HSAC. Funds could be shifted around to different <i>Result</i> areas, as long as majority agrees. 	
<i>Evaluation</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agencies provide annual report on outcomes. Due in beginning of the year Agencies submit quarterly invoices and reports 	HSAC provided the report, but don't use in the funding process. Felt that outcomes are more to help the agency than to help make funding decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HSAC and Council adopted a 90% performance clause in contracts, i.e., 100% payment if agency reaches 90% of performance goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To do focus group with agencies that are located in Renton to get feedback on process We provide quarterly report summarizing the agency reports. Late reports or incomplete are noted. The quarterly reports are posted on the web page. We are required to do CDBG monitoring visits of CDBG funded agencies once every two years.

Overview of Renton Human Services Funding Process for 2013/2014

		<i>HSAC Decision</i>	<i>Staff Decision</i>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We generally do not do monitoring visits of general funded agencies unless there is a problem or concern. Jointly funded agencies monitored in 2012/2013. • Staff develops a plan of action with underperforming agencies
Contracts			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The performance measures are negotiated as part of the contract process • All general fund contracts done by end of the first quarter of the year so that agencies can submit invoices and reports by the April due date. • To be paid, agencies must have current certificates of insurance with City. Staff tracks • CDBG contracts typically not done until June/July. City has agreed to front the funds for the programs funded by CDBG – otherwise only have half a year to spend funds